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ABSTRACT

Middle school literature has long professed the benefits of advisory programs, noting decreased drop out rates and improved school climate as possible rewards. However, advisory programs are often the most difficult component of the middle school program to implement, due to factors related to teacher resistance and a perceived lack of time for advisory activities. In fact, most advisories are unable to maintain the commitment to student interaction necessary for advisory success. This study sought to assess the effect of an Internet based advisory resource on middle school advisory implementation, focusing on the chief advisor complaint that the lack of time for activities negates opportunities for advisory success. The Internet resource was constructed and presented as a time saving aid for advisors, providing an easily accessible toolbox of advisory resources. Results suggested, however, that time constraints were not the key factors hindering wide spread advisory implementation, and that a web based advisory resource would not resolve the more human factors influencing implementation. Findings correlated to Ajzen and Fishbein’s Theory of Reasoned Action. Findings infer that attitudes of teacher resistance to advisory are a synthesis of individual beliefs and normative expectations. The perceived lack of administrative priority fits into this theoretical framework, inferring a significant need for administrative support of advisory. Mentorship and peer modeling emerged as the most valued formats for teacher training, while values related to personal sharing were found to be sporadic among the advising staff. Finally, findings implied that advisors’ perceptions of adequate time were dependent on their salient beliefs regarding the advisory program. Theoretical and policy implications for future program introductions and in-service training are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

The effectiveness of advisory programs has long been an issue of debate in middle school settings. Loosely defined, a middle school advisory is a regular time during the school day where an adult advisor meets with a limited number of students in a non-authoritarian setting to explore issues of character development, self-exploration, conflict resolution, and team building. However, the actual implementation of advisory programs differs widely from district to district on issues ranging from program focus to scheduling. For example, advisories might meet as seldom as once a month or may be a daily routine. Though research supports frequent meetings, many schools resist the daily commitment (Robinson, 1992).

Backers of advisory programs promote the relationship between the middle level child and the teacher/advisor as highly influential to student success, both socially and academically. According to proponents, when students make a lasting connection with at least one caring adult, academic and personal outcomes improve (Galassi, Gulledge, & Cox, 1997). However, Jackson and Davis (2000) point out that many advisory programs are never fully implemented:

An advisory period is potentially an important time for educators and students in middle grades to develop strong interpersonal bonds. We say “potentially” because, although often recommended for middle grade schools, advisory programs are often among the most difficult structures to implement, both because of practitioners’ lack of knowledge about what they are supposed to do, and, at times, because of parental and community concerns that educators are inappropriately intruding in their students personal lives” (143).

In practice, teachers often balk at committing to advisory programs, seeing the advisory as a separate curriculum, requiring extra planning and evaluative time, with little
administrative training or support provided for advisors to make their programs a success. As a result, many advisories simply wither into glorified study halls, with little substantive interaction between students and adults. Part of this failure seems to hinge on how the advisory program is first presented to the participating teacher/advisors. Cole (1992) found that advisor roles are not fully explained initially: “Failing to explain clearly the goals of TA (Teacher Advisory) and to gain full teacher acceptance of the program are probably the biggest causes of failure” (21). However, teacher resistance to advisory programs seems to be much more complex.

Teacher resistance, on any level, is not isolated to advisory programs. In fact, advisory programs are one of many programs that meet with teacher resistance in all levels of education. From technology, to curriculum, to counseling, teachers routinely fail to fully implement or commit to programs of educational change. As most teachers come into education with the goal of impacting students, it is natural to wonder what is at the root of this resistance. Research in this area states that most teachers cite the lack of adequate time for training, communication, and program implementation as key causes for program failure. In a recent study related to the importance of time in learning and sharing, nine barriers were noted, each related to use of time (Collinson & Cook, 2000).

Research on the time saving attributes of computer technology, especially with regard to Internet applications, reveals that most people perceive computers as a substantial time saver. In fact, it has become commonplace for people to rely on computers and the Internet for at least one aspect of their daily life, be it for work, school, home management, shopping, or communication (O’Toole, 2000). In the classroom,
Internet use is on the rise. In fact, use of Internet resources is one of the most widely used computer applications, both by teachers and students, greatly reducing the time involved in doing research and accessing information.

Given the time saving attributes of computer based applications, it seems logical to assume that a simple, usable web based advisory resource would resolve the dilemma of limited time for the teacher/advisor, thus improving teacher acceptance and implementation. With this in mind, the study hopes to answer the question, does enhanced technical support enhance teacher program acceptance or are teacher attitudes influenced more by other, more human, factors?

Definitions

Before any analysis of advisory can be initiated, certain key definitions must be understood. First, an effective advisory can be defined as one that fosters positive relationships with teachers and other students, emphasizes character building and self-exploration, aids in goal setting, and promotes student ownership. The typology for this sort of advisory can be categorized under three basic models: a) advocacy, b) community, and c) skills. In the advocacy model, the relationship between the advisor and individual student is paramount, whereas in the community-based model, the advisor seeks to build relationships within a small peer group to foster a sense of community or family. Skills based programs focus on the development of individual life skills (Galassi, Gulledge and Cox, 1997) Activities in all of these models focus on the construction of a group identity along with developmental guidance such as decision-making through the middle years.
The best advisories provide elements of all three approaches. Providing students with this sort of intervention requires not only a caring advisor well trained in listening techniques, but also requires a varied buffet of activities and resources that can be quickly accessed. The resource web site created for this study attempted to incorporate the elements outlined above, providing teacher/advisors with the resources and personal freedom to construct meaningful, effective advisories of their own.

Purpose of the Study

For many teachers, making connections with adolescents and having lasting impact on young lives is a guiding objective. Within the study of the core disciplines, however, the ability to make personal, meaningful connections with our students is, in present curricular structures, limited. William Glaser estimated in 1986 that the traditional classroom failed to engage more than half of the students in secondary schools (quoted in Cole, 1992). Due to the breadth of content curricula, lessons on decision-making, goal setting, and inter-personal relationships are few and far between.

This has been the case for some time. In fact, in a survey conducted in 1979, forty-one percent of Missouri students surveyed felt that “they did not know one teacher well enough to talk to if they had problems” (Johnson & Salmon, quoted in Galassi, Gulledge, and Cox, 302). It has been demonstrated, however, that a strong, structured advisory program can impact middle grade youngsters on a level that study in the disciplines cannot. Studies have shown that a sense of attachment to school personnel improves attendance, psychosocial climate, and academic achievement (Galassi, Gulledge, & Cox, 1997). In numerous studies, the dramatic impact that an effective
advisory program can have has been validated. Why, then, do so many teachers struggle with implementing and maintaining an advisory program?

Experience and research indicate that advisories are viewed by adults on a continuum, book-ended by two points of view; either as a waste of academic time or a panacea for all adolescent ills. Teachers often complain that preparation and execution of advisory lessons takes excessive time and diminishes their ability to prepare for core and encore classes. Those leaning toward the waste of time argument decry the time taken away from core classes, citing that, since no grade is given for advisory, the time is ill-used (Parker, 1999).

School administrators often push for advisories with the best of intentions, but, without provisions for proper training or supervision, undermine the success of their programs, and add credence to resisters. In fact, many teachers resist full implementation of advisory due to a lack of time, training, and administrative support. As expressed by Fibkins (1999),

Most advisors receive little preparation for this important job. We assume that advisory programs will be effective simply because of the good intentions involved. It’s like sending soldiers into battle without giving them basic training (41).

At a recent middle school conference in Michigan, several teachers attending a workshop on advisory frameworks voiced frustration at the lack of training and support they were given to implement a well-structured advisory. One teacher stated that she had simply been given 20 minutes at the start of each school day, and was expected to make the time worthwhile. Without needed training and support, teachers are forced to either patch together programs individually or treat the time as a study hall.
No more positive is the approach to advisory as a substitute for counseling. Though there is increasing pressure on advisors to infuse material on conflict resolution, healthy choices, decision-making, and tolerance education into their advisories, no more time is being manufactured to allow these topics to be handled with any degree of depth, nor is any substantial time being given to training (Lake, 1989). Advisory research shows that the advisor does not have time or training to tackle individual counseling issues. As noted in Jackson and Davis (2000), “Middle grades educators, other than professional guidance counselors, are not qualified to engage in counseling on sensitive personal issues” (144).

The question of who should provide training and support for advisors is often addressed in advisory literature. Most research focuses on the role of guidance counselors and advisory councils made up of teachers and parents as providers of this support, both in content and development. Harper, Shearouse, and Mills (1978) list a number of counselor and administrator responsibilities regarding advisory, including the following:

- Initiate and develop the program with principals and teachers
- Explain the program fully to faculty and involve them in decision making and planning
- Arrange and conduct monthly staff development sessions

Sadly, the principal is often the weak link in the chain, relegating advisory to a marginal priority. Research regarding advisor roles supports the need for training and program support from school administration, noting the need for administrative monitoring, evaluation, and protection from intrusions (Ayers, 1994). Sadly, administrators often fail to see the long-term value of an advisory program, and do not
support the program with resources and encouragement (Cole, 1992). Administrative priority is clearly an important factor in teacher implementation. The amount of attention given to a particular program by the administration is often perceived by the teacher as a reflection of the overall importance of that program to the school as a whole.

Though the aim of establishing a non-authoritarian relationship between the student and a caring adult has long been established as important in the development of the middle grades child (Brown, 1999), the reluctance of teachers to embrace this mindset often results in falling back on old habits, treating advisory as extra prep time. This reluctance may in part result from ill-defined roles and teacher uncertainty. “Teachers sometimes feel unprepared to branch into the realm of personal development, and are skeptical about what is being required of them” (Robinson, 1992, p. 35). Jackson and Davis (2000) add that reluctance to fully implement advisory can also result in a misuse of educational time: “When the advisory is performed in a perfunctory manner, which is unfortunately often the case, students’ and educators’ time is undoubtedly better spent in well crafted instructional activities” (143).

Though developmental agendas fostered in advisories are largely viewed as positive, the time required to prepare materials, coordinate resources, evaluate student output, and communicate with students and parents can hinder the effectiveness of the teacher, in the advisory as well as in their discipline. Realistically, many teachers must teach up to five core classes a day, along with an advisory or exploratory, as well as conducting their daily advisory. Time is a precious commodity, and if advisory activities are not readily available with a minimum of preparation, the advisory will become a lower priority (Robinson, 1992). In sum, for advisory programs to be successful, teachers
must be well trained and supported, with a consonant view of how time should be managed.

Research on advisory impact has shown that advisory programs can have a great deal of influence on the self-awareness and scholastic achievement of the middle level child (MacLaury, 2000). However, if teachers are unwilling to fully implement the program, the impact of the program will have negligible effect. Exploring the correlation between time perception and teacher attitudes could provide significant data regarding why teachers resist new educational programs.

The theoretical contribution of this study could reveal different conclusions, depending on the outcome of the study. If it is found that teachers do see technology as an aid in advisory time management, a correlation between technological frameworks and teacher attitudes could be surmised. If, however, teachers do not see this time saving technology as an aid to program management, other interpersonal or supervisory factors might be exposed as causational to program acceptance.

A review of pertinent literature, and institution of a pilot advisory Internet resource on which to base interviews might provide qualitative data on which to base future program introductions.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this research project, as it focuses on teacher attitudes, is grounded on relevant theory in cognition and behavior. The Theory of Reasoned Action, as proposed by Azjen and Fishbein (1980), seems a likely explanation for teacher resistance to new programs. The Theory of Reasoned Action suggests that a
person's behavior is determined by his or her intention to perform the behavior and that this intention is, in turn, a function of their her attitude toward the behavior and their subjective norm (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). A subjective norm is defined as a person's perception that most people who are important to him think he should or should not perform the behavior in question (Chang 1998). In forming this subjective norm, an individual takes into account the normative expectations of other sources that are important to them.

In an advisory context, the intention of the teacher to perform advisory activities is then dependent on the pre-existing beliefs held by the teacher (their attitude) regarding the advisory activities and the influence of colleague teachers and administrators regarding the priority and importance the activities should be given.

According to Ajzen and Fishbein, in order to gain deeper understanding of the factors influencing behavior, the researcher must look for the determinants of both the attitudinal and normative components. As they explain, those determinants are beliefs individuals hold about themselves and their environment or culture. Therefore, beliefs are viewed as underlying a person's attitudes and subjective norms, and they ultimately determine intentions and behavior (See Figure 1).

Figure 1. Influence of beliefs on attitudes and subjective norms influencing intention
As Ajzen and Fishbein define them, an attitude is an index of the degree to which a person likes or dislikes an aspect of their world. According to their theory, a person's attitude towards a behavior is determined by the set of salient beliefs they hold about performing the behavior. Salient beliefs, according to Ajzen and Fishbein, are a small number of beliefs that a person can attend to at any given moment. (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980).

To predict attitude from beliefs, one must draw out an elicitation of a subject's salient beliefs. However, in the context of actual studies, they suggested researchers identify the set of beliefs that are salient in a given population. These model salient beliefs can be ascertained by eliciting beliefs from a representative sample of the population. The beliefs that are most frequently elicited by this sample constitute the model set of salient beliefs for the population in question.

In summary, according to the Theory of Reasoned Action, an individual's behavioral intention is the most immediate factor influencing his/her behavior. This intention is a function of the individual's attitude and subjective norm. The individual's attitude and subjective norm are both considered a function of the weighted sum of the appropriate beliefs (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980).

The Theory of Reasoned Action is appropriate for this study. In assessing the impact of subjective norms, found in the normative expectations of teaching colleagues and administrators, on the salient beliefs of teacher/advisors, some explanation may be
found regarding teacher resistance or acceptance of advisory programs. If the theory is accurate, the impact of subjective norms will have little effect on the attitudes and intentions of those teachers with salient beliefs that support advisory programs. However, those teachers with weak or unformed beliefs about the program might be more influenced by the subjective norms of peers or administration.

The relationship between beliefs, attitude formation, and intention regarding advisory implementation will be explored in this study through interviews and the introduction of a new advisory resource web site.

Research Hypothesis & Rationale

From a practical stance, one would assume that findings from this study should conclude that accessibility to web based resources for advisory programs creates a positive change in teacher implementation, as web based resources provide quick access to needed materials, and reduce preparation time. However, considering the theoretical framework of Reasoned Action, it is more likely that the study will find the most influential expectations affecting teacher implementation lie in the opinions and values of teaching colleagues. Salient beliefs of teachers are not universal and teacher resistance to technology is a well known problem (Means, 2001). Therefore, stated administrative priorities may not have the desired impact when weighed against the influence of the teaching culture. This hypothesis is based not only on existing research, but also on the three-year developmental sequence at Noble Middle School (pseudonym), in which teacher resistance to advisory and technology implementation mirrored national findings.
At Noble, limited availability of resources and lack of advisory time have been the most prevalent complaints, even though a guidance driven advisory council has developed and provided extensive activity manuals. The perceived lack of time and resources, coupled with ill-defined advisor roles, created teacher anxiety that led to negative teacher impressions of advisory and limited implementation.

The lack of attention to teacher attitudes is the most over-riding factor in the success or failure of an advisory, as supported in Cole (1992):

Those experienced with TA (teacher advisory) programs caution that careful planning and preparation are keys to the success of a program. Failing to clearly explain the goals of TA and to gain full teacher acceptance of the program are probably the biggest causes of failure (45).

With this experience and research in mind, a study examining the factors that impede teacher acceptance and implementation of advisory programs, while measuring the effect of web based resources on teachers’ perceptions of usable time, is of substantial importance. Though findings relating an improvement in advisory acceptance due to technology integration would be encouraging, it is more likely that human factors will override the technical advances.
CHAPTER 2
BACKGROUND & SIGNIFICANCE

Review of the Literature

The central issues to this study relate to factors hindering or enhancing advisory implementation. Research into existing literature, it was hoped, might provide insight into research structure and methodology for this study. Though much has been written from a practitioner’s viewpoint, few targeted empirical research studies have been done on advisory implementation. This point adds validity to this study, as there is currently a gap in middle school research.

This review focuses on three strong empirical studies conducted on advisory implementation. In all three studies, the point was made that little research had been done on advisory and that theory regarding advisory was still developing. The first of these was done in 1992, and 10 years later, the same lack of research and theory exists. This review will look at the research problems, sample populations, sampling methods, and instruments used in these studies, as well as reviewing the findings and conclusions. Comparison of these should provide structural guidance for a much needed research study in advisory implementation.

Research Problems

The research problems in the studies by Robinson (1992) and Anfara & Brown (1998) were stated explicitly as analyses of teacher attitudes on implementation of advisories. All of the studies reviewed shared a base of common research questions, regarding obstacles to advisory implementation, attitudes about advisory, and personal valuation of the advisory program.
In Brown (1999), however, the research problem revolved around the effectiveness of commercially available advisory programs, prepared outside of the urban classroom where the study was conducted. Still, similar questions emerged as the interviews were conducted, related to factors that hinder advisory, teacher valuation of the program, and teacher perspective on the impact of their advisory.

*Populations and sampling techniques*

The populations for the studies varied widely, from inner city urban districts (Brown, 1999) to New Hampshire (Robinson, 1992), and New Orleans and Philadelphia (Anfara & Brown, 1998). This is helpful, as it presents a cross section of urban, suburban and rural middle school settings. In addition, the studies are racially diverse, questioning teachers in predominantly African American schools (Brown, 1999), suburban schools with a broad ethnic mix (Anfara & Brown, 1998), and predominantly white rural schools. Comparisons between these environments may point out common themes and patterns within advisory implementation.

The choice of sampling techniques seemed to favor the qualitative case study method, as two of the three studies used an interview schedule to collect data from a small representative population of teachers, questioning and collecting data from 3 to 6 teachers. Geographically, the representative schools varied widely, as well. One study (Brown, 1999) was conducted using only one school. Another study (Anfara & Brown, 1998) was conducted as a series of case studies in six middle schools in two metropolitan areas, and the third (Robinson, 1992) surveyed nine schools across the state. This is
helpful, as common themes from these studies indicate common concerns for advisors, regardless of school demographics.

The sampling was purposive in both of these case studies, drawing on insight from school principals in the choosing of teachers to participate in the study. Both of these studies also interviewed students, though this will not be done in this study, as this study is more focused on factors that influence implementation of advisory and not purely on advisory effectiveness.

One study (Robinson, 1992) made use of random sampling, sending out surveys to assess attitudes from teachers regarding advisory implementation. Though this method generates a large data set for analysis, this method seems inappropriate for the type of deep qualitative analysis needed for this study. It should be noted that this was designed as a descriptive study, and is, as such, unsatisfying, as a complete understanding of teacher attitudes is not realized.

Findings and conclusions

In all three of the studies, researchers found that teachers did not feel that the advisory program was successful, or at least as successful as it could be. In the study by Anfara & Brown (1998), though the students perceived the program as beneficial, advisors felt that the program lacked the organization and structure to make it really work. The findings also reflected a movement away from the intended non-authoritarian role to a more disciplined, classroom approach. This pattern may reflect some resistance of current advisors to adapt to the new program format.
In the case of Robinson (1992), the same issues regarding advisor implementation emerged as were found in Anfara & Brown and Brown. Advisors cited a lack of periodic training, a lack of participating staff, not enough time, and some adult intimidation. The finding of adult intimidation falls in with the theoretical framework proposed by Azjen and Fishbein (1980) regarding the influence of those of perceived importance on attitude formation and intention outlined in the previous chapter.

Brown (1999) found that teacher/advisors failed to establish a trusting, caring relationship with students. Brown notes the importance of this bond in an inner city setting, but also states that the lack of a personal bond was due in part to the inability to initiate substantive discussions between teachers and advisors. This was due in part to a lack training and comfort with the role of advisor.

Significance

The research studies reviewed provided several significant points in the creation and execution of this research study. In fact, many of the methods used by Brown (1999) are similar to the methods outlined in chapter 1 of this study, drawing solid parallels in findings. In sampling techniques, review of the literature indicates that the qualitative case study method would provide the best data for in depth analysis. Given that every school setting is different, this method will allow a complete picture of the research site to be created.

This literature review was primarily significant in highlighting the scant body of research done on factors affecting advisory implementation. It is hoped that the data and findings generated from this study will help fill a void not only in our understanding of
advisory implementation, but in our understanding of how to best implement and maintain any new promising educational program on the horizon.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS
Population and Setting

The study focused on teachers at a middle school in suburban Cincinnati, Ohio, known as Noble Middle School for this report. The school is located in a socio-economically upper-middle class area. However, the amount spent by the district per student continues to rank below the state average, averaging $6,463.00 per pupil, as opposed to the state average of $6,871.00 per pupil, according to the State of Ohio 2001 District School Report Card (See Table 1). The middle school is fairly new, having been built only three years ago. The school and its programs were designed to follow current middle school philosophy (Jackson & Davis, 2000), incorporating the key elements of solid middle school design.

Location

The school district (referred to hereafter as Sylvan School District) is located on the East side of Cincinnati. Sylvan serves a predominantly affluent community, with a median household income of $50,637 as compared to a median for the county of $29,498. (Anderson Township,n.d.) This is according to the full breakdown of district spending and population from last broad census (See Table 1).

Noble is the only middle school in the district, serving around 1300 seventh and eighth grade students. There are five teams in each grade level, each with approximately 130 students. There are five teachers per team with an intervention specialist and a counselor serving each. Though the numbers are high, testing results reflect a successful
school, posting the highest numbers ever recorded on the 9th grade proficiency test (2001) after the school’s first two years of operation.

Designed to become a national model of middle school philosophy, Noble incorporated a full, daily advisory program from its inception. Though the program has been revised over the past three years, the administration maintains it is fully committed to supporting the advisory model.

Sampling Method

Several sampling techniques were considered for the study, but purposive sampling was chosen due to the researcher’s knowledge about the advisory population in the study (May, 2000). Participants needed to work at Noble Middle School, have between 5 to 10 years of teaching experience and at least two years of experience with some sort of advisory program. This type of sample reflects the most recent wave of teacher/advisors to come to Nagel. The study focused on teachers from three teaching teams on the seventh and eighth grade level.

These sample criteria ensured that the teachers were well versed in advisory procedures and also that the teachers were relatively new but comfortable in their role as classroom teachers. Beyond that, the age and gender of the subjects was not used as a variable.

Research Design

To investigate the relationship between the goals of the advisory program and the teacher advisor’s reluctance or acceptance of these goals, this study used the case study method of qualitative analysis. Defined, a case is a subject, such as a classroom, a
committee, or a program, comprised of an assemblage of interacting parts that make up a functioning whole. The case to be studied contains problems and relationships, and the report of the case is likely to have a theme, but the case in itself has its own entity. To carry out our study of the case, it is often useful to organize the study around situational and contextual issues (complicated problems), about which people disagree (Stake, 2002).

As explained by Yin (1984), the case study method is attractive in a research study focused on teacher attitudes, as this method is “generalizable to theoretical propositions” (21). This study hopes to draw implications between teacher attitudes of acceptance or resistance and the theoretical proposition posited by The Theory of Reasoned Action. Based on this correlation, the cased study method is appropriate.

For this study, the case consisted of a group of faculty advisors functioning as a working part of a middle school environment. The complexity of the problems involved in implementing a new program such as an advisory make a case study a perfect method for generating conflicting opinions and trends. The case study method allows the teacher attitudes and intentions generated in interviews to be easily related to Reasoned Action theory. This method has been tried many times and found to be a direct and satisfying way of improving understanding (Stake, 2002). Therefore, the case study method of qualitative analysis is a useful model for this sort of study.

Limitations of the case study method revolve around the conflicting definitions as to what constitutes a case and the risk of not fully saturating categories (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). This is a distinct possibility in this study, as the limited number of subjects (6) does weaken category saturation.
One of the frequently cited limitations of the case study method is the difficulty in generalizing the findings. The counter-argument is that generalization of case study findings is a legitimate outcome, based on an understanding of the nature of that generalization. The nature of the generalizations here are quite specific, regarding teacher/advisor attitudes on personal sharing and technology use. Therefore, the counter-argument is supported.

Related to the generalizability issue is the concern that case studies can oversimplify or exaggerate a situation, leading the reader to distort or erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs, as distinct from the report itself. This is a danger with a study such as this, requiring thorough coding and categorization of patterns to avoid oversimplification of findings.

Skillful data collection, analysis, and reporting can reduce the possibility of this skewed outcome, although it is characteristic of the case study that interpretation goes beyond the mind of the researcher to that of the reader (Winegardner, 1999). Therefore, data collected through interviews and observations of teacher/advisors must be carefully planned and transcribed. In addition, data analysis and coding should remain meta-cognitive, taking into account the bias of the researcher.

Analysis in this study must also take into account possibility of the interviewer effect. The interviewer effect refers to the effect of bias, multiple interviews, and subject compliance on research findings (Martin and Beerten, 1999). With these considerations in mind, data collected from the following subjects was closely analyzed following the open coding techniques dictated by the Theory of Grounded Research endorsed by Strauss and Corbin (1998).
Participants

As previously noted, the participants in this study were chosen based on purposive sampling. However, the background of the subjects varied greatly. The following biographical sketches are provided to aide in processing of data from the study. Each participant is identified by a pseudonym to protect his or her anonymity.

Jenny McCormick

Jenny has been teaching for 7 years in the district and was involved with the opening of the new middle school. Her teaching experience is primarily with eighth grade students. Her approach to advisory is positive and flexible, though she does have doubts as to her skill in implementing the program. As was stated in her interview, Jenny responds well to recognition from her administrators. However, she cited a lack of adequate time as a key complaint in making advisory successful.

Lisa Ruddick

Lisa has been teaching in the district for the past three years, but came to the district from another program in which advisory had been attempted but not fully implemented. Her background made her transition to the middle school environment more comfortable, as she brought activities and resources with her from her previous district. In addition, Lisa was the only participant who had advisory-based pre-service training as a component of her university experience.

Lisa feels her team takes advisory seriously, but does not feel that communication is good school wide regarding advisory issues. She also noted that the lack of time and the intrusion of administrative duties were the key hindrances to full implementation.
Mona Carl

Mona also came to the advisory program with a number of activities for student interaction. Mona came to the Noble Middle from an elementary program in the district devoted to character building and conflict resolution. Mona’s view on advisory emphasized the importance of personal investment, and focused on the importance of “being yourself” in the advisory setting. However, Mona also noted that the lack of time and administrative interruptions impeded the impact of her advisory and other advisories, as well.

Brittany Kirby

Brittany has been teaching for five years in the district. Brittany is personally invested in the program, acting as a mentor to a new teacher on her team on matters related to advisory implementation. Though she feels advisory is important, she does not feel that enough time is allocated to ensure the success of the program, and seems unsure as to the parameters of her role as advisor.

Jerry Warner

Jerry was a new teacher in the district this year, though he had experience with a form of advisory in his previous school where he taught fifth grade. His expectations for advisory were high, noted as a reason for accepting a job with the school. Jerry’s advisory program emphasized flexibility and growth in student ownership. As with other participants, time constraints and external intrusions were noted as the biggest obstacles faced.
Mike Owens

Mike was also a new teacher with the district this year, but had a very different perspective on the advisory program. By prioritizing his duties, Mike perceived that the advisory was the least important duty within his role as teacher. Mike linked the time constraints and external intrusions with the lack of administrative accountability, citing these points as evidence that the program was not a valued component of the middle school program.

Additionally, Mike’s extensive background with educational computer technology gave him a unique perspective, as technology is often mentioned as a key area of teacher resistance. However, Mike’s awareness of teacher resistance to technology did not inform his perspective regarding resistance to advisory.

Instrumentation

Data were gathered from March through May of 2002, using in-depth interviews and on-site observations. An interview schedule, making use of a set of directed questions, was used to ascertain teacher attitudes. Initial interview questions focused on perceived qualities of successful advisors, perceived teacher attitudes, training, and obstacles to implementation. Follow up questions addressed the time saving impact of the advisory Internet site, site utilization, technical pros and cons of the site, and perceived teacher resistance technical and (See Appendices C and D). These questions were presented orally, recorded, and transcribed. Although this process can be time consuming, the limited number of participants (6) made the advantage of enriched participant response worthwhile.
After each interview, data was transcribed and analyzed before follow up interviews were conducted. Emerging concepts from initial interviews were then focused on in subsequent teacher interviews (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Limitations revolve around the limited number of respondents. A more in depth study would require a greater number of schools and interviews to get a broader picture of teacher resistance and implementation research.

*Procedures*

The study was conducted following the procedures outlined by the University of Cincinnati Human Subjects Committee (Guidelines for research at the University of Cincinnati are available at [http://www.osp.uc.edu/](http://www.osp.uc.edu/)). After obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the site of the study, Noble Middle School (pseudonym). Entry into the school was negotiated based on an existing relationship as a veteran teacher on sabbatical within the Sylvan district.

An overview of the study was presented to the middle school principal, and a list of 12 potential research participants was generated, based on the criteria set forth in the sampling section. After an initial e-mail and phone call to invite the research candidates to participate, a group of six was decided on, based on time, availability, and interest.

*Data Collection*

Initial interviews were conducted at the end of the school day or during individual planning time. Before these interviews were conducted, consent forms were reviewed and explained to ensure informed consent from the study participants. Subjects
were also informed that there would be no compensation for participation in the study beyond the reflection and knowledge gained from the discussions.

Before the consent forms were signed, the presence of the tape recorder was noted and procedures regarding personal privacy were addressed. Signatures were obtained and interviews begun. All interviews were conducted in an open-ended fashion, based on guidelines set forth in Grounded Theory. (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). These initial interviews lasted approximately 40 minutes each, and were individually recorded, transcribed, and analyzed.

The advisory Internet resource was introduced at the conclusion of the initial interview, and demonstrated to each subject. Input on additional features was taken and, in some cases, incorporated into the site. The site included the following features:

- A weekly schedule template with possible daily activity categories
- Activities aimed at easing transition to the eight grade or high school
- Links to online learning inventories (Multiple Intelligence Assessment, Meyers-Briggs Learning Style Inventory, Keirsey Temperament Sorter)
- Advisory web links (student activities & teacher resources)
- E-mail addresses for program coordinators
- An online advisory discussion board
- A Power point presentation outlining aspects of successful advisories as proposed by current research

(See Appendix A)
Site use was limited to advisors in the research study. Advisors were encouraged to use the Internet resource during the study, evaluating the site as a time saving aid to advisory planning and implementation. The site is located on the Oz Internet server of the University of Cincinnati and can be accessed at http://oz.uc.edu/~highleta/advisory/html.

Following the initial interviews, responses were transcribed and labeled, noting any emerging categories or trends.

Within two weeks of the initial interview, an informal field observation was scheduled and conducted during the subject’s advisory time. No field notes were taken during the observations, as the intent was to provide a point of reference for the follow up interviews. A brief informal discussion of how the advisor felt the session went was conducted and a final interview scheduled for two weeks later.

The follow up interviews were conducted in an open-ended fashion, drawing out opinions and prompting discussion regarding the time saving effect of the advisory web site and other issues impacting advisory success. As with the initial interviews, responses from the participants were transcribed. Open coding providing labels, categories, and a rubric for recurrence that allowed for conclusions to be drawn.

The data collection methods used follow the methods described in the Grounded Theory of Research. This approach allows data from interviews to be coded and examined empirically, while maintaining the holistic insight gained from qualitative studies (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).
Data Analysis

As previously noted, open coding was used for the data analysis of the study. Initial and follow up interviews were conducted, recorded and transcribed, yielding 1165 lines of transcription on the initial interviews and 859 lines of transcription on the follow up interviews. The disparity between the initial and follow up transcriptions can be attributed to two factors. One subject was unable to participate in the follow up interviews due to a travel obligation. Secondly, follow up interviews tended to pick up on themes from previous discussions, and were therefore more direct in nature.

The initial and follow up interviews were grouped into two separate transcriptions to aid in finding contrasts and comparisons in the data. After transcription, the data was analyzed on a paragraph level and labels were generated from meaningful interactions. Memos were also made in instances where coding revealed possible findings and/or conclusions. Each interview was then summarized by listing appearances of labels within each individual interview. Next, data were categorized by counting and ordering recurrences of similar labels within each interview.

Several categories appeared numerous times throughout all or most of the interviews. These categories were ordered based on recurrence and listed as major patterns. Some categories appeared only once or twice per interview, but were found in two or more participants, and were therefore deemed relevant. These categories were ordered based on recurrence and listed as secondary patterns.

The resulting data from this coding technique were primarily qualitative in nature, though some quantitative data emerged as well. As described in the Grounded Theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), this is not an uncommon outcome. The qualitative
data were drawn from opinions generated from open-ended questioning, but the use of
the transcriptions as a database produced numerical data that could be compared and
analyzed. These patterns and trends allowed the researcher to construct theory and draw
conclusions based on empirical, as well as qualitative, data.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

Major Patterns in Initial Interviews

Questioning in the initial interviews focused broadly on the following issues:
time and training for advisory duties, job satisfaction related to the advisory role,
perceived attitudes of fellow teachers regarding the advisory program, and obstacles to
successful implementation (A full list of the initial interview questions can be found in
Appendix B). These questions were generated, primarily, from readings on advisory
implementation, though some questions were based on personal experience with advisory
programs. As the interviews proceeded, several key categories began to emerge.

Perception of Time Constraints

The initial interviews revealed a number of significant patterns. The trend most
agreed on in the initial interviews was the value of time. The lack of sufficient time to
prepare or conduct advisory programs was repeatedly mentioned as the single greatest
obstacle to successful advisory implementation. Mona’s response was typical of the
interviewees.

Well, I feel like a lot of the time is taken up with administrative things,
and it shouldn’t be that way. PTA has to pass things out, and they use
advisory time to do that. Counselors need information from students.
Those are all important pieces and I don’t want to diminish them, but it
takes little pieces of time. As a result, you never feel like it’s a solid
program. I don’t feel that way.

Mona’s feelings regarding time limitations were voiced by Brittany, as well, who voiced
some frustration at perceived non-responsiveness from administration:
We have about 20 minutes, but that includes taking attendance, answering questions, preparing for field trips…if there is a behavioral issue, that takes some time. Plus, you’ve got announcements. So, there are some days where you just don’t get to an activity. So, I have voiced my opinion to the administration, but there needs to be more time.

Brittany noted that manipulation of the schedule could result in extra advisory time, which she noted was valuable. Furthermore, Brittany stated that for advisory to “really have an impact,” the daily block of time had to be broadened. “Time,” she noted, “is a huge factor. My biggest obstacle.”

Mike Owens also struggled initially with the constraints on advisory time, but resolved the issue by simply eliminating the activity portion from his advisory.

To tell you the truth, I never got into a pattern of doing activities in advisory. It became more of an attendance/announcement period. By the time we get the kids settled, it’s 7:22, announcements come on at 7:33, so you’ve got about 10 minutes to do an activity. I tried to do an activity a week for the first few weeks, but you would run out of time…you could never get into a rhythm early in the year cause there were always other interruptions.

The feeling of being “overwhelmed” by new teacher responsibilities and unprepared for the role of advisor forced Mike to prioritize his responsibilities to survive. For Mike, advisory became a low priority in his school day. Mike was new to the district, and perceived the lack of adequate time as an indication of the low importance of his “advisory duty.” As Mike reported,

Teaching five classes a day plus encore, if something was going to slip, it would be the advisory. So, that wasn’t a goal of my year. Once you get into a pattern, it’s hard to change.

Mike continued that his advisory became a time to set up for his teaching day, while allowing students to talk or finish homework. In fact, on the issue of time, Mike
suggested cutting down the advisory to ten minutes, passing character-building activities on to core class teachers.

Lisa Ruddick had a more positive perspective on the advisory experience but agreed on the issue of time limitations. Noting an advantage of an earlier advisory model, Lisa felt an afternoon advisory was in some ways preferable to the morning meeting time.

The afternoon was nice, because I could settle kids down who were having problems so they wouldn’t explode on the bus. Now we do not have that closure… There are pros and cons to that. Maybe we could do a long session in the morning and a short one at the end of the day.

Lisa’s opinion illustrates an interesting point regarding teachers’ perceptions of time. In Mike Owens’ interview, he felt less time should be allotted to advisory. In Lisa’s case, even more advisory time was necessary.

As in all other interviews, administrative interruptions were mentioned as Lisa’s primary obstacle to effective time management. Lisa noted that passing out materials, counseling issues, and announcements slowed things down on a daily basis. An interesting point was made regarding the Pledge of Allegiance, which is done on a daily basis.

September 11th changed my mind on this. I used to think once a week was fine, but now I think it needs to be done respectfully and daily. Repeating it daily makes it relevant at some time during the week.

This adds emphasis to the personal value of time, as individual perspectives on how time is best used vary based on personal beliefs. Lisa’s final recommendation to improve advisory hammered home the value she placed on time. “Add five more minutes. It’s hard to continue topics on subsequent days.”

Jerry Warner echoed the sentiments of his colleagues regarding time.
Time constraints, external intrusions, forms and stuff...I know it’s important, but it is a problem. I look at advisory as a 15-minute time frame, not a 20. You never have a full 20 minutes.

Jerry Warner was new to the district, but had a solid sense of advisory structure. Additionally, rather than viewing the advisor role as a separate entity, his views on time limitations and administrative interruptions emphasized the commonalities of the teacher and advisor roles. “If you view it (advisory) as a class, the interruptions are a pain. If you take advisory seriously, then you take interruptions seriously.”

Time constraints in advisory could be defined as either preparation time for advisory or engaged time during the advisory period. According to the subjects, however, it is during the engaged time that they felt the most pressure. Given the overwhelming agreement on the issue of engaged, student time as a limited but precious resource, one would assume that the introduction of an Internet advisory resource would be welcomed. In fact, at the end of the initial interview, all participants noted that they were eager to try out the Internet based web resource as a way of using time more efficiently during advisory sessions. Time, however, was not the only influential pattern to emerge from the interviews.

_Stances on Personal Sharing_

Perhaps the most relevant theme found in the initial interviews emerged from two seemingly unrelated patterns. Though the pattern of personal sharing seemed initially separate from the pattern of perceived teacher resistance, closer analysis reveals that the two patterns are related. In a sense, an individual’s stance on the sharing of personal
information from their own life represents two sides of the same coin, and may be central to why some teachers value advisory and some do not.

The issue of perceived teacher resistance was common throughout the interviews, with more than half of the participants noting many times that other teachers in the school did not buy into advisory programs and that change with those individuals was unlikely if not impossible. Although no particular teachers were named, it was clear that a substantial camp did not feel advisory was worthwhile or even necessary. Key elements of this resistance seemed to lie in the lack of willingness of resistant advisors to share a personal side, a lack of peer mentorship, and weak administrative priority.

Jenny McCormick addressed the issue of personal sharing in advisory. From her comments, it was clear that some teachers feared the risk of exposing their vulnerability to a class.

The teacher has to be willing to try new things…some aren’t willing. It’s out of the norm. Let’s take somebody who’s taught social studies for 20 years, and then they get this advisory, where it’s a whole new ballgame. I mean you’ve got you’re routine down, and then you think, “Oh, this is brand new!” And you have to put yourself out there. Some teachers, and I might be wrong about this, they’re the teacher and the student is the student and that’s that.

According to Ms. McCormick, the traditional boundaries between teacher and student must bend in an advisory setting. Jenny went on to say how she does share her human side with the students, though it might have some negatives attached, such as blurring the student/teacher boundary.

In her response to the question on training, Jenny felt, as all other subjects did, that the absence of advisor training reflected a lack of administrative priority. Jenny went
on to discuss another possible reason for teacher resistance, noting the role of administrative authority on teacher acceptance and attitude.

Without training, teachers get turned off. They see it (advisory) as something not valued by the administration enough to spend time on. I know that is an issue with other teachers; “Oh, another lesson plan I have to prepare because my principal says so.

Mona Carl shared Jenny’s view that teacher resistance was high to advisory programs, but, in responding to the need for communication among advisors, touched on a point that may also influence teacher acceptance. Mona expressed that the pressure to conform at the school was substantial, and that some teachers resisted conforming, due to a lack of confidence in their ability to run their job like their colleagues.

Some advisors might be intimidated if they’re not running their advisory like someone else. Then they doubt themselves. You may lose something trying to be like someone else.

Dovetailing off of this point, Mona went on to endorse the concept of a mentorship or peer-modeling program for advisory. This idea was also proposed by 50% of the subjects, most noting that any mentoring of advisors should be done in an informal setting based on similarity of styles.

Brittany Kirby, who was among the teachers that opened Noble Middle School, noted that teacher resistance was at an all time high when the school first opened, but that some resistance still existed.

You’ve still got some teachers who say no, I’m not going to do this and they don’t believe in the whole program. They think it’s a waste of time. But, you just have to work around them… I think it’s going to be a long-term problem here at the school.
Brittany went on to say that age could contribute to teacher resistance, but that full participation was not likely. “You’re never going to have 100% participation. I think that’s an ideal; that’s a dream. I’d love for that to happen, but you’re always going to have somebody who’s tired and says, “Well, I just don’t see the value of this.”

As with the majority of the respondents, Brittany felt a part of the advisor role involved personal sharing, something not all teachers are comfortable with. It was noted that there is little time during core classes to open up and share personal stories, but most felt that was an important aspect of the advisor/student relationship.

In discussing ways in which teachers could be influenced to improve their acceptance of the advisor role, Ms. Kirby noted that pressure or administrative authority is not enough to make a teacher comply. This corresponds with the attitude of all other respondents, who endorsed mentorship as an alternative. Again, the concept of peer mentorship emerged as a possible tool for improving teacher comfort level and participation.

The interview with Lisa Ruddick revealed many of the same patterns found in earlier interviews, focusing on the value of personal sharing as a key to positive advisor interaction. Lisa admitted that not all teachers share that view. “No, not all teachers are willing to show a more human side, which is fine. Everybody’s personality and comfort level are different.”

Though Ms. Ruddick had a form of advisory experience in her previous district, discussion revealed that teacher resistance was strong there, as well.

The school I came from had a daily 40-minute program where we watched Channel 1 (youth based TV news program), had announcements, and for the other half hour, had study hall. I tried advisory activities with
my kids, and at first tried to get other staffers to join in. Some teachers just ignored the kids for 45 minutes and let them do whatever they wanted.

Lisa’s attempts at influencing the beliefs and behaviors of established teachers at the old school were met with resistance, perhaps due to the strength of environmental factors.

Ms. Ruddick’s comments on positive advisor attributes highlighted a misconception regarding job requirements that became evident throughout all of the initial interviews. Half of the respondents stated that advisory duty was mandatory, but the other half noted that you had a choice in whether to take on an advisory or perform another duty, such as parking lot supervision. This seems to reveal a lack of clarity in articulation of advisor responsibilities and roles.

In speaking with Jerry Warner, little it was clear that he viewed the willingness to share his personal side with the students as a requirement for good advising. Jerry noted that personal sharing by the teacher was a way to model behavior for his advisees.

I develop an open advisory climate by modeling behavior. If I expect them to share their feelings or experiences, I have to be willing to do it, as well. I share first.

Likewise, Jerry strongly endorsed personal sharing and peer modeling as key to in-service advisory training. In fact, Jerry mentioned the benefit of a teacher retreat at the beginning of the school year as being an invaluable part of modeling his own advisory.

You have to use peer modeling and personal experience to really get into the activities. The retreat was a great experience. We got together over two days and did activities together. There was some grumbling about it from staff, but you really got the idea of how you can learn more from each other.
In addition to his retreat experience, Jerry acknowledges the presence of an informal mentor on his teaching team who influenced his perception of advisory. Jerry stopped short of endorsing a mandatory mentorship program, but he clearly felt he had grown in his competence as an advisor due to the interaction and guidance gained through peer modeling.

The stance on personal sharing shared by the most of the subjects reflected valuation of the type of non-authoritarian interaction embodied by advisory programs. A majority of the advisors in the study (5 of 6) mentioned the importance of some sort of personal investment as a key element of a successful advisory. Though the articulation of this belief was expressed in a variety of ways, using terms such as enthusiasm, or personal sharing, or “being real,” the examples from the interviews clearly fit into the personal sharing category.

As this label was used in coding, recurrence was high in 3 of the 5 respondents who expressed similar sentiments. In response to the question regarding essential traits for a middle school advisor, Jenny McCormick expressed the need for enthusiasm.

You have to be into trying new things. Like every Friday, we talk about Survivor (a reality based TV show). The kids think, ‘Wow! She watches Survivor!’ That’s a connection. It makes you real to the kids.

Jenny also reflected a level of personal involvement and ownership as she discussed resources used in advisory.

Well, I taught Sunday school, and I have some stuff from there. I use the web sites with puzzles on them. I collect resources from in-services. I do a lot on holidays, too. On Thanksgiving, I made a big turkey for the bulletin board, and had the kids write down what they were thankful for.
For Ms. McCormick, the most important advisor trait was to embrace an advisor role with blurred boundaries, encouraging students to share by sharing herself.

Mona Carl and Brittany Kirby expressed similar sentiments, noting that the advisory gave them a chance to really get to know their students, as well as let their students see a different side of themselves. Both noted sharing childhood stories and “taking risks.” Brittany also expressed a desire to have the students get to know her as a person, not just a teacher, for clearly professional reasons.

You can’t build rapport unless they know you’re a real human being. I think it’s important for the students to get to know you... to understand that you’re not perfect.

If teachers are to meet the advisory goals of intercepting student issues or are to increase the sense of ownership among their student population (Galassi, Gullede, & Cox, 1997), this data would reflect a strong personal investment from the advisor is essential.

Though the Mike Owens did not discuss the resistance of other teachers to a great degree, his own feelings of reluctance and discomfort in the advisor role were evident. Mike’s key critiques revolved around the lack of formal advisor training, a lack of accountability for advisory duties, and a need for rewards. However, Mike did not feel his was alone in lack of participation.

To be quite honest, I don’t think I’m alone in not spending a lot of time on advisory activities. What they say (advisory) is isn’t the way it is… You’re put on a team, you have an advisory. There’s no choice. I mean I like the advisory setting, but I don’t feel I’ve bought into it, and you have to be honest with yourself sometimes. Maybe I will next year. But, personally, I would gladly give up advisory to do lunch duty.

Mike’s critique of the program spilled over to the administration quite often. The lack of accountability and lack of a reward structure for participation conflicted with the perceived demands of the administrative authority.
On six occasions, Mike mentioned the need for some sort of reward for participation. The following example is typical of Mike’s responses.

I also think teachers should be paid for summer advisory training. Give the teachers opportunities to come in and pay them for doing so. If it’s important to you (administration), the only way to show that is by giving the teachers something in return.

In his interview, the importance of personal sharing was never mentioned as an important advisor trait. Rather, the findings from Mike’s interview support the need for incentives or rewards as essential to promoting advisor implementation. Mike stated that few people would do new programs without some form of incentive.

Mike’s discussion focused a great deal on the lack of choice in taking on the advisor role. His frustration at having to conduct advisory as a new teacher was obvious in his response to a question regarding how to handle new teachers in advisor roles.

First, you don’t put new teachers in advisory. So what if a class has 25 instead of 20? To me, that’s not a big deal. Along with that idea, unless you have 12 new teachers in the building, why not pull a phys ed teacher or health teacher who’s been teaching for years to co-teach the advisory? Therefore, this new teacher gets the help they need without being overwhelmed by the program.

Mike’s stance on his values came up vicariously in noting how he would prefer students spend their advisory time.

I would rather my students get an assignment completed rather than sit and talk. You know, the kids have not bought into advisory either. It’s not the most important part of their day.
Major Patterns in Follow-up Interviews

Subsequent to each initial interview, the advisors in the study were introduced to the advisory Internet resource, and instructed on its use and available resources. As the key advisor complaints related to a lack of time for in class advisory activities, the time saving aspects of the web site were emphasized, both for planning and execution of advisory. Many of the web site activities could be run from one computer and shared with the advisory on a TV monitor. As all classrooms had a computer and TV with external line hook ups, this could have been easily done. Several teachers noted that they had done similar things with computer to TV projection in their classrooms. Alternately, computer lab time was available for advisors who wanted students to have one on one interaction with online learning style inventories or logic puzzles.

The site also provided a number of one time and reusable advisory activities for seventh and eighth grade. The theme of transitions was used, as students were in their last quarter and preparing to make the shift to either eighth grade or high school, most involving interaction and question/answer periods between seventh and eighth grade advisories or visits from current freshman from the two district high schools. Additionally, web based tools for student self exploration, links to professional articles on advisory, and logic puzzles were included. Though the site was not comprehensive enough to support a full academic year of advisory, it was sufficient for the limited duration of the study.

Teachers were eager to make use of the web site, noting, as in the case of Mike Owens, that the advisory notebook “…was useless to me. I don’t know
where the notebook is half the time. I would rather have it online.” The notebook
is a comprehensive listing of activities and monthly themes prepared by the
advisory committee. Though in its third version in three years, subjects pointed
out that the “binder” was still not widely accepted or implemented by advisors.

Following the interviews, advisors took 4 weeks to explore and implement
the web site as was most appropriate for their advisory group. Within this time
frame, an informal observation was conducted to more fully understand the tone
and purposeful activity of the advisory. Follow up interviews in May. It should be
noted, however, that Jerry Warner was unable to participate in the follow up
interview, limiting the number of participants in the second round of interviews to
five.

Again, the goal of the web site was to minimize the amount of time spent
preparing activities and maximize the impact of the advisory period. Follow up
interviews sought to ascertain what, if any, impact the advisory web site could
have on perceived implementation and acceptance of the advisory program. A
positive correlation might promote the endorsement of time saving technology as
a component of advisory programs. Negative or unresponsive feedback might
point to other factors influencing broad acceptance of new programs.

The major trends that emerged from the follow up interviews would seem
to indicate that perceived teacher resistance is not substantially diminished by
availability of Internet resources. Rather, teachers view resistance to technology
as another facet of program resistance within staff advisors, thus negating any
improvement in advisory implementation. This trend is related to the second
major pattern; lack of site utilization. Although advisors had ample time, opportunity and incentive to make use of the site, most reported very limited use of the site. However, all participants endorsed the site as something of great value to advisory activities.

The most significant pattern revealed that teacher perceptions of time constraints are not affected by time saving technology. Though most reported that the site did save them time when the Internet advisory resource was used, the majority of subjects (4 of 5) responded that more time for advisory was still needed. The fifth subject felt that the site would have no significant effect on timesavings since the majority of the middle school staffers would not use it due to resistance to technology.

*Perceived Teacher Resistance to Technology*

The issue of perceived teacher resistance was a commonly recurring pattern, emerging in most of the interviews. Most subjects reported that, although they found the site helpful, they also felt it would not be used widely by other advisors, due to the presence of technology resistance. Lisa Ruddick touched on this position. “The site is pretty easy and helpful, especially if someone likes computers. If a teacher were tech phobic, though, it might cause a problem.”

Brittany Kirby emphasized the same point, noting that computer use in advisory, “…depends upon the person. If you have a teacher that doesn’t like the computer, the paper based advisory binder would better. But, if you have a computer savvy person, they will use the computer.” Both Brittany and Lisa felt that the web site was more convenient, noting that, since they already had to use
the computer for e-mail, going to the web site was easier. Still, their statements indicated doubts as to the attitudes of the full teaching staff regarding computer acceptance in their advisory.

Mike Owens’ training and experience with technology provided him with a more informed perspective on technology resistance, if not advisory resistance. Mike was quite specific in his views on technology resistance as a factor in Internet advisory resource implementation.

In order for this to be valuable to our staff, we will have to wean them off of paper. The way our staff is trained right now, I don’t know how valuable (the site) would be for the major population, but there’s a population of 10 to 15% who would use the site right now. Hopefully, that would grow.

Mike reported his estimate of 10 to 15% of current staff as technologically proficient enough to use the site with enthusiasm. However, considering the size of the teaching/advisory staff (75), this would correlate to site usage by only 7 to 11 teachers. Mike blamed this perceived teacher resistance to technology on weak in-service training.

The big weakness in our tech programs here is teacher education. Training…how do we get teachers to use it. The worst thing is to create this great thing, and teachers no know how to use it. The weakness I see is how do we implement this so it gets used.

Mike’s perception of how to influence teachers to use technological tools revolved around small, continuous training groups. “Large group meetings are a waste of time.” He also endorsed providing incentives for incorporating technology into the classroom, and focusing on those teachers with a willingness to participate.

I feel some people are never going to want to do new things, particularly with tech, so we waste our time with those people. Some people aren’t “yes” people or “no” people, but are “maybe” people. Those
are the people we need to focus on. The “no” people might never change their mind.

Mike’s words were similar to those of other subjects who felt advisors needed to be willing to share, replacing willingness to participate in human interaction with technological interaction.

On the subject of incentives and rewards, Mr. Owens echoed a sentiment heard in the earlier initial interviews, relating the need for human appreciation.

There have to be incentives. I feel like, if there are no incentives, there’s no change. Some may change for change sake, but the majority are going to want something in return. Administrators think teachers will do it because they should, but that’s not how we work.

In discussing an experience with his previous school, Mike went on to explain that rewards for behaviors need not be tangible.

At my old school, I worked really hard to build a technical infrastructure, and at the last staff meeting, the principal failed to mention that I was leaving, and he didn’t thank me. All I wanted was a thank you. All teachers want is to feel appreciated. I say teachers, but that applies for all humans. You want to feel appreciated, and when you’re not, you close that door.

Both of Mike’s points regarding tech resistance and the power of acknowledgement on teacher behavior were supported by findings from Jenny McCormick’s follow up interview. In describing potential usage of an advisory resource web site, Jenny reported that some teachers would refuse to use a computer.

Oh, some people will balk. No question. Someone on our team doesn’t even use the computer. Email, grades, it’s always a huge ordeal. There are some teachers who are resistant to technology, and they would say “Now I’ve got to get online to get an activity?”
As with Mike, Jenny also felt that large group training environments were ineffective and reinforced teacher resistance.

Large group training sessions is just another way that administration is telling you what to do. And that was the initial response of some of the teachers the first year. “They can’t make me do advisory! I am not a camp counselor!” I could be wrong, but you are always going to have resistance to advisory, and in a large presentation, it will be perceived as just another thing the administration is trying to force on faculty.

However, the impact of professional acknowledgement was reinforced later in the interview. In describing a recent interaction with her school principal, she illustrates the power of administrative acknowledgement.

The principal came up a week ago and said, “I had a mother call me today. She was so excited about the letter you sent home from advisory, praising the job the parents had done in raising their son.” The principal told me how proud he was and that he wanted to come up to my room and tell me what a good job I did. I called my husband right after that. I felt really good.

In discussing this incident, Jenny revealed that, although teachers are supposed to have a stronger sense of self-esteem and need less behavioral reinforcement, “in reality, we’re just as suffering as the students.”

In sum, data from the follow up interviews seems to indicate that perceived teacher resistance to the web based advisory resource was dependent on the comfort of teachers with computer technology and appropriate training. Due to unfamiliarity or distrust of computers and the lack of substantial validation or praise from valued professionals in their school culture, subjects felt the Internet resource would receive weak implementation.
Lack of Site Utilization

Another evident pattern in follow up interviews related to the lack of web site utilization by study participants. As previously noted, all subjects were to a greater or lesser degree excited about the availability of the web site for advisory use. Furthermore, in follow up interviews, all participants endorsed the content and format of the advisory web site, noting only that future printable versions and online video would be helpful. However, most subjects admitted to only occasional use of the site as a resource for advisory. This outcome was somewhat surprising, as the site was presented as a way to alleviate the time constraints reported by all subjects.

In all probability, the initial enthusiasm shown by subjects toward the Internet resource was due to the interviewer effect, mentioned in the methods section. This led subjects to tailor their responses to meet the expectations of the interviewer and express a greater interest than normal. However, one exception to the limited utilization was Mona Carl, who reported extensive use.

I wasn’t sure about (the site) at first, but once I got started exploring, I thought ‘This could be very usable.’ Especially in crunch time, and particularly with a sub, to be able to say “Go to this web site and choose something.”

Other subjects did not mirror Mona’s use. Though all reported some use of the site, further discussion uncovered more limited use. Ironically, Mike Owens, whose views on the implementation of technology focused on staff resistance to computer applications, made the least use of the advisory web site. When prompted as to his personal use, the response, “A little bit. Not recently,” was immediately contradicted by his statement, “I go to the web for everything, from movies to shopping.” Clearly, the
lack of utilization for Mr. Owens reflected the low priority he assigned to the advisory task.

Brittany Kirby initially claimed to have used the site to a large degree, but revealed later that she had actually only visited the site once or twice. “I have to admit, I only looked at it a couple of times. So, I didn’t go through in depth.” This lack of use did not keep respondents from endorsing the site, which they felt was strong in content, format, and usability. Along with Brittany, Lisa Ruddick also admitted to infrequent use of the site, but stated a long-term availability would increase her site utilization.

Reasons for the limited usage of the site are difficult to conceive, as all noted that the site was easy and helpful to use. Perhaps the answer lies in the teacher/advisors perception of prioritization and available time.

*Impact of Internet Resource on Advisory Time Constraints*

The final major pattern to emerge from the follow up interviews was that, though availability of a web based resource would save time and could improve advisory implementation, subjects did not perceive that a web site alone would alleviate the time constraints within their daily advisory. Though these findings may sound contradictory, the research participants noted several technical and interpersonal factors as evidence of their beliefs.

Lisa Ruddick believed the web site did save time, but stated that login difficulties could negate any gains made in the advisory time. Responding to the question, could the website be a significant time saver, Lisa replied, “It is, but you’re going to have to log in,
and you don’t have computers for all the kids. It’s going to take five minutes to log in, so the time issue is still going to be there. You can’t do it all in one session.”

In reality, though login procedures at Noble Middle School do take time, the actual time is roughly 50% less than Ms. Ruddick felt was necessary. This could imply that the real issue is not the actual time, but the perceived interpersonal time necessary to successfully interact with students.

Brittany Kirby also commented on this dilemma in her evaluation of the website. Though she noted the benefit of home access and the convenience of age appropriate activity categories, the need for more time was still expressed. “We still need an extra 5 to 10 minutes. It is tough to get done with everything when you only have 15 minutes for the activity.” Brittany’s sense that time could be saved in one arena and not be felt in another was a recurrent theme.

Mona Carl addressed the same issue of scheduled time versus interaction time in her follow up interview.

The advisory program here, as it stands, needs time. The website will aid the time, if people are willing and able to use it. It won’t add time for discussion and activities. The announcements and interruptions are still an issue. So time is our greatest enemy in terms of success.

Though Mona states that extra time is needed if meaningful interactions are to take place, she admits the difficulty of negotiating that time.

I do feel that the teachers not doing advisory fully would balk, because it’s just another five minutes they don’t know how to use. That would be a tough sell, though. We did take time away from lunches already, and many teachers complain that they are not getting enough academic time with the kids.
Though the requisite time for advisory was a primary complaint of Ms. Carl’s, the problem of teacher resistance reemerged. Mona concluded her interview with a comment on another possible reason for teacher resistance to new programs such as advisory.

I think teachers feel pretty overwhelmed as it is, and adding something to an already full plate…taking on the duties of the parent…here it seems spotlighted. And there’s liability. It’s pretty daunting, I think.

We take our jobs very seriously, and so that’s a lot we’re being asked to do. I don’t think we’re unable to do it, but there is a fear that we won’t do new things well. I think teachers want to do their jobs well…to nail it.

With respect to teacher competence, Ms. Carl felt that a lack of teacher skill and preparedness in a particular area were largely responsible for teacher resistance.

In summary, the findings from the initial interviews reflected a belief that time constraints and stances on personal sharing were at the heart of teacher resistance and full implementation of advisory, with a stated need for better training, through peer modeling or mentorship.

In follow up interviews, patterns emerged from the data that revealed a perceived resistance to technology use and a lack of site utilization that would hinder the effectiveness of a time saving Internet resource, due to teacher discomfort or distrust with regards to computer based applications. Again, lack of an adequate and appropriate training model was mentioned as a factor to teacher resistance. Additionally, teachers seemed to equate acknowledgement and verbal praise with administrative priority. The presence or lack of this acknowledgement influenced the perceived amount of priority the administration put on the program. The sense of personal competence was also
mentioned as a factor in program implementation, as teachers need to feel comfortable and confident in the performance of their teaching duties.

With regard to the time, teacher/advisors expressed a need for human interaction time that could not be met by Internet technology. Though findings reflected the site would be beneficial over the long run, teachers noted that more time would be necessary, for those teachers that valued personal sharing. These findings were the most expressed patterns in the data from both interviews.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the impact of a time saving Internet resource on teacher attitudes regarding middle school advisory programs. It was hoped that results of the study would provide information on overcoming resistance in other instances of new educational program introduction.

Though the study did not provide sufficient data to fully endorse the use of an Internet resource as a cure for time constraints, the study did produce findings that have bearing on future research involving new program introductions. Findings reflected the theoretical frameworks proposed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1998) regarding the Theory of Reasoned Action. The following conclusions point out the correlation to Reasoned Action and lay the groundwork for the implications and recommendations discussed in chapter 6.

1. Teacher resistance or acceptance of advisory programs is a product of individual and collective attitudes.

According to the Theory of Reasoned Action, a person’s salient beliefs are at the root of their behaviors. These behaviors are ruled by intentions to perform the behavior, which are influenced by the attitudes of the individual and by the subjective norms or expectations of important people in the individual’s environment. In school settings, the model below (See Figure 2) charts the interplay between collegial and administrative influence.
Figure 2. Application of reasoned action framework to middle school environments.

The perception of broad teacher resistance to advisory programs requires strong individual beliefs on the part of advisors who are willing to implement advisory. These salient beliefs may be influenced by early educational experience or by exposure to and appropriate training in related programs early in the individual’s teaching career.

In this case study, the normative expectations of administration have not influenced subjective norms enough to overcome attitudes of resistance. Moreover, conflict within the normative expectations undermines attempts at influencing behavior change. In short, continual interaction with resistant colleagues may have more influence on an advisor’s subjective norm than poorly communicated expectations from administration.
However, findings support that personally communicated normative expectations of administrators have a greater effect on teacher attitude than the normative expectations of resistant colleagues.

2. The perceived lack of administrative priority translates to a reduction in perceived advisory importance.

   Findings reflect that the overwhelming responsibilities of middle school teachers encourage prioritization of job responsibilities, with an emphasis on those duties with high accountability, such as classroom teaching in the core disciplines. Findings from this study indicated that the advisory role is the least accountable in the teachers’ job responsibilities. The lack of incentives or personal acknowledgement in the program weakens teacher motivation to comply. Low attention to these areas affects the teachers’ perception of administrative priority. This also corresponds to the theoretical framework of this study.

   The Theory of Reasoned Action notes that individual attitudes depend on perceived expectations from those people valued as important and influential in their environment. In a school environment, when these normative expectations are not articulated by administrators, the normative expectations of other important people, such as teaching colleagues, may affect the salient beliefs and attitudes of the individual.

   Findings in this study would seem to support this stance, as the lack of administrative attention to advisory activities weakens the influence of administrative priorities on teacher attitudes and behavior. Without strong salient beliefs in favor of
personal sharing, teacher/advisors are open to the influence of more outspoken resisters to educational programs.

Findings also showed that, when acknowledgement was received either formally or informally, teacher attitude was impacted in a positive way. This sort of informal professional validation may be tied to normative expectations. Future studies on the balance between conflicting normative expectations may shed light on this area.

3. *Resistance to technology hinders the impact of technology on program acceptance.*

Related once again to reasoned action, perceived colleague expectations regarding technology use are more prevalent than administrative expectations in the same area, thus causing a conflict within the subjective norm. Findings in this case reveal that teachers’ attitudes regarding technology are more impacted by interaction with other teachers than stated priorities of administration. Again, this is due to a perceived lack in appropriate training in the use of computer technology. This lack of training may again be perceived as weakness in priority by administration

4. *Mentorship and peer modeling are valued by teachers as the most beneficial formats for teacher training.*

Analysis of findings from the data found a strong correlation between peer modeling and mentorship programs and teacher implementation. Again, when colleagues influence subjective norms embraced by administration, conflicts between normative expectations are reduced, thus strengthening influence on the subjective norm and influencing intention. Though this study was limited in scope, and did not focus on
implications of peer modeling programs, data overwhelmingly supported this approach to advisory instruction. Future research in this area might be fruitful.

5. Values of effective advisors are not universally shared among teaching staff. Findings showed that the willingness to share a personal, human side is not universal among classroom teachers. Subjects reflected that this is not representative of the teachers’ skill in the classroom, as many excellent teachers do not value personal sharing. Limited choice and required participation were noted as areas impacting teacher participation in advisory. Misunderstandings involving stance on choice were evident, as well.

Relation to the reasoned action framework may lie in the salient beliefs of individual teachers. Strength in salient beliefs regarding traditional student/teacher roles may create resistance to subjective norms from either colleagues or administration. Findings reflected that changes in teacher attitude should not be forced, as this would strengthen commitment to salient beliefs, those beliefs where teachers feel most competent and self-assured.

6. Advisors’ perceptions of adequate time are dependent on salient beliefs regarding the advisory program. Though this conclusion is not related to the Theory of Reasoned Action, recurrence of the pattern indicates that the finding is significant. The data on teacher perceptions of time constraints revealed that an advisor’s need for time depends on how much the teacher/advisor has bought into the program. Teachers who valued the program
expressed a need for more time within their schedules to deal with individual student
issues. However, findings indicated a desire to reduce the amount of time given to
advisory by those who do not value the program. This would seem to indicate that the
appropriate amount of time for any program is based on the value the individual invests
in it. Simple re-allotment of scheduled time is not sufficient to resolve time constraints.

Based on the data, it becomes evident that successful human interaction cannot be
neatly scheduled. The amount of time necessary for successful advisories is dependent on
more than the clock or the Internet. One research study on teachers’ and perceived time
articulated this idea well.

Until now, suggestions for providing time for teacher learning have
generally represented a reallocation of time within a fixed schedule and
have represented a uniform conception of time. However, the teachers’
complex and interrelated interpretations of time call for nothing less than a
radical rethinking of time that includes more flexibility in teachers
schedules, allows more teacher-directed time for learning and sharing,
…and recognizes the dynamic interplay of factors that encourage or hinder
teacher learning and the dissemination of knowledge. Continuing to
respond simplistically by “making time” within the confines of existing
school schedules ignores teachers’ multi-layered meanings when they say,
“I don’t have enough time.” (Collinson & Cook, 2000)
CHAPTER 6
IMPLICATIONS

The implications from this research study on advisory implementation are grounded in conclusions drawn from data from a qualitative case study. As such, these implications are not intended to be definitive prescriptions for educational practice, but are submitted as fruitful areas for investigation based on the findings. The implications reach into the areas of training, administration, staffing, and time management and are largely based on the theoretical framework of Reasoned Action.

First, referring to the conclusion regarding teacher resistance as a product of individual and collective attitudes, the study would seem to support enhanced personal involvement in advisory from administration. As stated, the normative expectations of administration have not influenced subjective norms enough to overcome attitudes of teacher resistance. Findings did show that administrators were valued as important in the teachers’ environment, but that interaction and acknowledgement regarding advisory was lacking.

This is related to the finding regarding administrative priority, as a lack of attention to the advisory program was often translated as a weakness in priority. Informal observations of, and participation in, advisory activities by administrators might provide a level of professional accountability that advisors might equate as enhanced priority for advisory programs.

The resistance to technology found in the study holds similarities to the resistance to advisory programs in the area of adequate and appropriate training. This technology resistance correlates to earlier research on the subject (Eurich-Fulcer, R. & Schofield, J., 1995), which noted that appropriate training affects attitudes toward technology. Findings
were fairly conclusive as to preferred methods of training. In both technical and advisory arenas, subjects responded most strongly to peer–to-peer, small group training models, emphasizing mentorship as holding the most potential for attitude change. This is also theoretically sound, as subjective norms are influenced by normative expectations of those most valued by an individual.

Within advisory training, organized and on-going peer modeling of advisory activities could result in a positive change in the salient beliefs of even resistant advisors. Again, changes in prior salient beliefs are dependent on subjective norms. Training based on peer modeling or mentorship constitutes an influential set of normative expectations. This commitment to advisory training would also reflect enhanced administrative priority

The issue surrounding compatibility between individual personality traits of teachers and qualities of effective advisors reveals a practical implication. More care should be taken in the choice of personnel for the advising staff. Findings of this study emphasized the importance of advisor comfort with personal sharing as a key component to advisory success. More traditional teaching styles that emphasize prescribed roles for students and teachers are not easily overcome in an advisory setting, and may do more harm than good.

Based on the findings, teachers should be interviewed and selected for advisory leadership roles based on their commitment to personal sharing, and their enthusiasm to engage with students in non-authoritarian settings. Teachers not selected for these advisory duties could then be assigned to other duties, such as administrative support roles, for the advisory periods. Though the Theory of Reasoned Action emphasizes the influence of the subjective norm, the time required to facilitate change is an unknown
variable. Therefore, the selection of advisors with compatible teaching styles might promote improvement in advisory success. However, this recommendation does not answer the staffing issues that would emerge from such an arrangement.

Finally, with regard to the impact of a time saving advisory Internet resource, it is clear that, though convenience would be enhanced in the organization and implementation of advisory activities, teacher/advisors do not see the value of technology with regard to human interaction. Teachers’ need for time reflected the value they placed on personal sharing and the importance of getting to know students on a more human level. This point highlights the findings of Collinson and Cook (2000), who found that simple reallocation of time will not solve the problem, as individual conceptions of how time should be allocated varies widely from teacher to teacher.

The implication of this study would suggest that, though an Internet resource for advisory programs might be a useful additional component, it is not an answer to the time constraints felt by individual advisors. Research into what other factors might lessen the perceived time constraints on teachers may be a fruitful subject for future study.
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### Table 1

**Sylvan District Profile**  
*State of Ohio District Report Card (2000)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Sylvan</th>
<th>State Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Enrollment*</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>6,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in the District Less Than Half the Year (%)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in the Same School Less Than Half the Year (%)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Families Receiving Ohio Works First Cash Assistance (%)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Families Eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch (%)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$43,136</td>
<td>$43,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average number of students enrolled during the school year; used to calculate spending per pupil.

### Teacher data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sylvan</th>
<th>State Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Students Per Teacher</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers Certified in Their Teaching Area (%)</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Classes (All) Taught by Teachers with Appropriate Cert. (%)</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Courses (Core*) Taught by Teachers with Appropriate Cert. (%)</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attendance Rate (%)</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Core courses are courses corresponding to state proficiency test subjects.
Revenue Sources Per Pupil

Local Funds $3,911 $4,209
State Funds $2,313 $2,215
Federal Funds $95 $131
Total Revenue Sources Per Pupil $6,319 $6,555

Annual Spending Per Pupil

Instruction (such as teacher salaries and classroom materials) $3,822 $3,973
Building Operations (such as utilities, maintenance, and repairs) $1,171 $1,283
Administration (such as administrators & office staff salaries, office supplies) $593 $743
Pupil Support (such as librarians, counselors, and nurses) $654 $755
Staff Support (such as teacher training and college courses) $222 $117
Total Annual Spending Per Pupil $6,462 $6,871

* May include money from bond levies to fund start-up instructional costs for new buildings.

Revenue Sources

Federal (1.5%) State (36.6%) Local (61.9%)

Spending Per Pupil

Instruction (59.2%)
Pupil Support (10.1%)
Administration (9.2%)
Building Operations (18.1%)
Staff Support (3.4%)
Appendix A

Advisory Internet Resource Web site

Access to the advisory Internet resource web site can be obtained the following URL:

http://oz.uc.edu/~highleta/advisory/html
Appendix B

Initial Interview Questions

1. What was your first contact with the advisory program?
2. What are the elements of a good advisory?
3. What traits should an advisor have?
4. What resources do you use most?
5. How well trained do were you going into the program?
6. What are the biggest obstacles to running an effective advisory?
7. How have other teachers reacted to advisory?
8. How is communication and collaboration between advisories?
9. What recommendations do you have for improving the advisory program?
10. What advice would you give a new advisor?
Appendix C

Follow Up Interview Questions

1. How much did you use the advisory resource web site?
2. Did the web site add to or diminish stress regarding advisory planning?
3. What features did you like about the site?
4. What technical obstacles did you encounter?
5. Do you feel other advisors would use a site like this for advisory?
6. What improvements would you make to the site?
7. Would a site like this save you time?